James Hecimovich is editor of PAS Reports.

Cover design: Dennis McClendon

Planning Advisory Service is a subscription research service of the American Planning Association. Eight reports are produced each year. Subscribers also receive the *PAS Memo* each month and have use of the Inquiry Answering Service. Israel Stollman, Executive Director; Frank S. So, Deputy Executive Director; Judith Getzels, Director of Research; Sylvia Lewis, Publications Director.

Planning Advisory Service Reports are produced at APA. James Hecimovich, Editor; Adele Rothblatt, Assistant Editor.

© Copyright December 1987 by the American Planning Association, 1313 E. 60th St., Chicago, IL 60637. APA has headquarters offices at 1776 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington, DC 20036.

Planners' Salaries and Employment Trends, 1987

James Hecimovich

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part 1. Where Planners Work 1
Little Change in Where Planners Work 1
Fewer Public Agency Planners Working in Large, Urban Jurisdictions 2
A Look at Regional and State Representation 2
Over Half of Respondents in Highest Experience Category 4

Part 2. Salaries 5
Qualifications and Type of Employer 5
Years of Experience 8
Comparisons by Size and Type of Jurisdiction 9
Directors and Staff 11
A State-by-State Breakdown of Salaries 12
Minority Representation and Salaries 13
Women Make Gains in Representation and Salary 14

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Where Planners Work: Public Agency 1
Table 2. Where Planners Work: Nonpublic Employment 2
Table 3. Where Public Agency Planners Work: By Size and Type of Jurisdiction 2
Table 4. Where Planners Work: Regional 3
Table 5. Years of Planning Experience 4
Table 6. Planners' Median Salaries: By Sex, Qualifications, Experience, and Employer 6
Table 7. Planners' Median Salaries: By Sex, Qualifications, Experience, and Employer 6
Table 8. Planners' Median Salaries: By Sex and Employer 8
Table 9. Planners' Median Salaries: By Sex and Years of Experience 8
Table 10. Planners' Median Salaries: By Years of Experience 9
Table 11. Planners' Median Salaries: By Sex, Qualifications, Experience, and Jurisdiction Size 9
Table 12. Public Agency Planners' Median Salaries: By Jurisdiction Type 10
Table 13. Nondirectors' Median Salaries: By Sex, Qualifications, Experience, and Employer 11
Table 14. Directors' Median Salaries: By Sex, Qualifications, Experience, and Employer 12
Table 15. Planners' Median Salaries: By Sex and State 13
Table 16. Distribution of Planners: By Race/Ethnicity 13
Table 17. Planners' Median Salaries: By Race/Ethnicity, Qualifications, Experience, and Employer 14
Table 18. Years of Planners' Experience: By Sex 15
Table 19. Where Planners Work: By Employer and Sex 15
Table 20. Planners' Median Salaries: By Sex 15

Part 1. Where Planners Work

This report continues the series produced by APA on the salaries and employment characteristics of its membership. The surveys used to gather the data for this report were mailed in October 1987. Of the 16,730 nonstudent, professional planners surveyed, 7,408 (44.3 percent) responded and provided the information upon which this report is based. The response rate is up four percent from the response rate in the 1985 salary survey.

Part 1 of this report documents the employment patterns of APA members in 1987—where they work and who they work for. It compares these figures with data drawn from past surveys—especially the 1985 survey—to illustrate changes in planners' employment. In Part 2, the salaries that planners earn are compared on the basis of years of experience, the state in which they work, size of jurisdiction, type of employer, education, and sex. These variables are also applied to salaries reported by agency directors and other heads of departments and firms, nondirectors, and minority group planners.

LITTLE CHANGE IN WHERE PLANNERS WORK

The percentage of planners working in public agencies who responded to the survey in 1985 was at an all-time low for the membership salary survey. The figures for 1987 show a slight rebound in that number. (See Table 1.) There were small gains in the number of planners working for city agencies and state agencies. The increase in the percentage of city planners continues a series of increases since the salary surveys began in 1977. The increase in state planners reclaims some of the huge loss evident in figures between 1983 and 1985. We still have no explanation, however, for the sharp decrease in that prior two-year period. The percentage of planners working in federal agencies continues to decline, as it has since 1981. Changes in representation in other public agency categories are insignificant.

The percentage of planners wor' ing in the private sector is down slightly since 1985. (See Table 2.) Despite the decrease, the percentage of planners working for nonpublic agencies in 1987 is the second highest in the history of the sal-

TABLE 1. WHERE PLANNERS WORK: PUBLIC AGENCIES

	Percent of Total Respondents			
Pubiic Agency Employment	1981 (N = 5,206)	1983 (N = 5,126)	1985 (N = 3,766)	1987 (N = 4,716)
City Planning	26.3%	28.6%	33.8%	35.1%
County Planning	11.4	12.7	13.7	13.4
Joint City/County	2.6	3.0	2.9	2.9
Metro or Regional	8.5	7.4	6.6	6.1
State or Provincial	10.9	13.4	2.1	4.8
Federal	4.0	3.5	2.8	2.8
Total	63.7%	68.6%	61.9%	64.5%

TABLE 2. WHERE PLANNERS WORK: NONPUBLIC EMPLOYMENT

Nonpublic Employment	Percent of Respondents 1981 (N = 2,656)	1983 (N = 2,325)	1985 (N = 2,318)	1987 (N = 2,604)
Consultants	18.6%	17.2%	20.4%	18.5%
Private Business	4.6	4.8	4.6	3.5
College or University	6.1	4.0	6.2	4.8
Nonprofit	3.1	3.3	3.1	2.5
Other	2.3	1.8	3.8	6.4
Total	34.7%	31.1%	38.1%	35.7%

ary reports; only 1985 representation was higher.

The "other" category showed an increase. A quick review of several hundred records for those respondents who answered "other" (and who wrote in the type of agency in which they worked) revealed a wide variety of employers, including a real estate development firm; law firm; regional utility; and zoning department. There were a number of respondents who circled the "other" answer who worked for community development or economic development departments.

FEWER PUBLIC AGENCY PLANNERS WORKING IN LARGE, URBAN JURISDICTIONS

After reporting a nearly even distribution of planners in 1985 among the various size jurisdictions defined by the survey, the 1987 survey shows a drop of three percentage points (a rate of change of a little more than 33 percent) in the percentage of planners working in large (250,000 and greater population) jurisdictions. (See Table 3.) This loss resulted in nearly even gains in middle-size and small jurisdictions.

TABLE 3. WHERE PUBLIC AGENCY PLANNERS WORK: BY SIZE AND TYPE OF JURISDICTION

Jurisdictions	Percent of Respondents 1983 (N = 4,509)	1985 (N = 4,107)	1987 (N = 4,334)
Size			
250,000 and over	31.8%	32.6%	29.6%
50,000 to 249,999	35.7	34.3	35.9
Under 50,000	32.5	33.1	34.5
Type (Self-Defined)			
Urban	53.1%	53.1%	39.8%
Suburban	26.5	28.5	24.3
Rural	16.0	16.5	11.6
Mixed	4.0	1.9	24.3

For the middle-size jurisdictions, the 1985–1987 gain reverses the slight loss reported for the 1983–1985 period. Small jurisdictions have posted gains in planner representation in each of the last four salary surveys. In 1981, a little more than a quarter (27.7 percent) of planners worked in small jurisdictions; that percentage is now up to over a third (34.5 percent) of public agency planners.

These shifts in representation among jurisdictions based on population translate into an interesting shift in representation among the types of jurisdiction that planners say they work for. (See bottom of Table 3.) All three "typical" types of jurisdictions (urban, suburban, and rural) showed losses of representation. Urban representation declined more than 13 percentage points (a rate of change of 25 percent); suburban representation was down 4.2 percentage points (a rate of change of nearly 15 percent); and rural representation was down nearly five percentage points (a rate of change of nearly 30 percent). All of the change meant a huge gain (22.4 percentage points) in the "mixed" category.

It would appear that planners see themselves working in jurisdictions where the character of the community varies with parts of the community. The high rates of change for the urban and rural categories, coupled with the less drastic change for the suburban category, may mean that suburbs are truly becoming cities and farmland on the edge of some suburbs is giving way in more places to "exurbia." At least, perhaps, planners see it that way. And who should know better? Verification of such a drastic shift will be evident only if the 1989 figures are similar to these, but this trend is not surprising given the coverage to urban corridors, impact fees, and farmland preservation in the planning press.

A LOOK AT REGIONAL AND STATE REPRESENTATION

There does not appear to have been any significant movement of planners from one region to another during 1985–1987. (See Table 4.) The only positive changes greater than one percentage point occurred in the New England region (+1.1 percentage points; a rate of change of 18.9 percent). For New England, the increase in planner representation is the third in a row since 1983, and, at least by our survey results, there are more planners working there now than there have been since 1981. On the table, the South Atlan-

tic states show an increase in representation of 3.6 percentage points, but this change must be qualified. In the 1985 figures, Georgia was incorrectly listed among the East South Central states. It has now been added to the South Atlantic region to be in agreement with the regional alignments of the U.S. Census Bureau, from which we draw regional population figures. The shift of Georgia to the South Atlantic region also explains the great rate of change in the East South Central region.

Losses in the number of planners working in the Middle Atlantic and East North Central states continues a trend that has been evident throughout the 1980s. Since 1981, the Middle Atlantic states have lost planners at a rate of 16.1 percent. During that same period, the rate of change for the East North Central region has been a negative 19.2 percent. The largest rate of loss for the 1985–1987 period (–14.3 percent) occurred in the West South Central states. The loss reversed a similar gain reported in the 1985 salary survey.

Using regional population figures for 1985, drawn from the Census Bureau's 1987 *Statistical Abstract*, it is clear that the planner-to-population ratio is good in New England and is excellent in the South Atlantic states, the Mountain states, and the Pacific region. On the other hand, planner-to-population ratios in the Middle Atlantic, East North Central, and West South Central regions are poor.

When we looked at state-by-state representation in mak-

TABLE 4. WHERE PLANNERS WORK: REGIONAL*

Regions	Percent of Respondents 1985 (N = 6,524)	1987 (N = 7,408)	1985 Percent of U.S. Population	Regions	Percent of Respondents 1985 (N = 6,524)	1987 (N = 7,408)	1985 Percent of U.S. Population
New England	5.8%	6.9%	6.3%	*West North Central*	6.5%	6.2%	7.3%
Connecticut				Iowa			
Maine				Kansas			
Massachusetts				Minnesota			
New Hampshire				Missouri			
Rhode Island				Nebraska			
Vermont				North Dakota			
				South Dakota			
Middle Atlantic	11.3	10.4	15.6	*West South Central*	7.7	6.6	11.1
New Jersey				Arkansas			
New York				Louisiana			
Pennsylvania				Oklahoma			
				Texas			
South Atlantic	19.0	22.6	16.8	*Mountain*	8.5	8.6	5.4
Delaware				Arizona			
District of Columbia				Colorado			
Florida				Idaho			
Georgia				Montana			
Maryland				Nevada			
North Carolina				New Mexico			
South Carolina				Utah			
Virginia				Wyoming			
West Virginia							
East South Central	5.4	3.5	6.3	*Pacific*	21.6	21.7	14.7
Alabama				Alaska			
Kentucky				California			
Mississippi				Hawaii			
Tennessee				Oregon			
				Washington			
East North Central	12.6	11.4	17.7	*Canada*	1.6	1.2	—
Illinois							
Indiana				*Other*	—	0.8	—
Michigan							
Ohio							
Wisconsin							

*See also Table 15 below for numbers of responses from individual states.

TABLE 5. YEARS OF PLANNING EXPERIENCE

Years of Experience	Percent of Respondents			
	1981 (N = 8,134)	1983 (N = 7,476)	1985 (N = 6,645)	1987 (N = 7,350)
Under 5 years	26.9%	16.8%	22.6%	17.6%
5 to 10 years	38.3	44.4	29.2	30.7
Over 10 years	34.8	38.8	48.2	51.6

ing up the regional tables, it becomes clear that not only is representation of planners better in some regions than others, but it is usually better in each state in that region, with some states having remarkably good planner-to-population rations. In the Pacific region, for example, California has 15.7 percent of the respondents to the survey and 11 percent of the 1985 U.S. population; Washington has 2.7 percent of the respondents, compared to 1.8 percent of the population; and Oregon has 2.2 percent of the respondents, compared to 1.1 percent of the population. Alaska and Hawaii also had better-than-even planner-to-population ratios. Florida followed California in representation in the survey with 7.5 perent of the respondents. The largest discrepancies in representation in the survey compared with population were in New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Texas.

Using the 1981 report for baseline data, it becomes clear that planning jobs in the 1980s have been gravitating to Florida, where the number of respondents has risen from 393 to 553, an increase in survey representation from 4.8 percent to 7.5 percent. The losses in the 1980s also become clear—New York has fallen from 492 respondents (6.0 percent of the survey) to 328 respondents (4.4 percent); Illinois has fallen from 373 to 249 respondents (or from 4.6 percent to 3.4 percent); and Pennsylvania, which had 320 respondents (3.9 percent of the survey) in 1981 now has only 244 or 3.3 percent of the respondents.

OVER HALF OF RESPONDENTS IN HIGHEST EXPERIENCE CATEGORY

In 1985, we said that experience figures revealed the "graying" of the profession. The 1987 figures reveal the extent of that graying even more clearly. For the first time in the history of the reports, one experience category—the over 10 years category—accounts for more than half of the respondents. (See Table 5.) During the 1980s, this category has shown a rate of change of more than 48 percent. The middle experience category remains close to the all-time low recorded in 1985, and entry-level planners make up less than a fifth of all respondents to the survey.

In 1985, we speculated that the graying of the profession might mean that jobs would open at the entry level. This year, we did a finer breakdown of information about experience that indicates 19 percent of the respondents have more than 20 years experience, but only 4.3 percent have more than 30 years experience. It seems unlikely that enough people will leave the field through retirement any time soon to make a big difference in the makeup of the respondents. And that may translate into even greater differences in the makeup of respondents by experience level in future salary surveys. As we have noted in past surveys, this gradual rise in the median level of experience also carries over into consideration of planners' salaries, as will be evident in Part 2.

Part 2. Salaries

The median salary of all planners rose to $36,000 in 1987, an increase of $1,934 or 5.7 percent in the 1985–1987 period. This increase is clearly in line with inflation figures over the past two years. We did not see an increase similar to the very large one (15 percent) that occurred during the period 1983–1985 because there was not a great change in the median experience level. For the individual planner who wants to know how his or her salary compares to the salaries of other planners, it is best to consider the median salary of planners with similar years of experience. This year's report has refined the breakdown of salaries by levels of experience in some tables. We have also added a breakdown of median salaries by state rather than by region in response to the many calls we have had in the past two years seeking median salary levels by state.

QUALIFICATIONS AND TYPE OF EMPLOYER

Tables 6 and 7 indicate the effect of academic degrees on salary levels, as well as relating salaries to type of employer, sex, and years of experience. It is clear that, with few exceptions, planners who have a master's degree earn more than planners with only a bachelor's degree. Planners with a Ph.D. or law degree can expect to earn higher salaries. The low number of responses in the lowest and middle experience categories makes any meaningful comparison of the salaries of planners with a Ph.D. or law degree with those of planners with a master's or bachelor's degree very difficult. For men with over 10 years experience, however, a comparison is possible. And it is obvious there that a Ph.D. or law degree does mean a higher salary.

Because a significant majority of respondents to the survey have a master's degree and because the combination of employers provides a greater scale of salaries, median salaries reported by planners with a master's degree in each category shown in Table 6 should give us a good idea of which planners have received a greater-than-average increase in the past two years.

For planners with fewer than five years experience and a master's degree, male planners working for state or federal agencies and women working in a city, county, metro, regional, state, or federal planning agency, or in a university or foundation received increases greater than the 5.7 percent increase for all planners. These increases ranged from 7.4 percent for men in state or federal agencies to 13.1 percent for women in the city, county, joint, metro, regional category.

In the middle experience category, greater-than-average increases were received by men with a master's degree who work in a state or federal agency (7.5 percent) and as consultants or in business (12.5 percent). Women with a master's degree received better than an average increase if they worked for a city, county, joint, metro, or regional agency (6.6 percent); in a state or federal agency (9.1 percent); or for a university or foundation (13 percent). Peculiarly, male consultants in this category reported a significant increase while women working as consultants reported a loss (−4.1 percent) in median salary.

For planners with a master's degree in the highest experience level, only those planners working in a state or federal agency reported a median salary increase less than 5.7 percent. The salaries of men in those agencies rose only 5.6 percent, while women working there were given only a 4.7 percent increase over the past two years.

Table 7 provides a finer breakdown of median salaries by employers. Planners working for the federal government, as consultants, and in business continue to earn the highest salaries among planners at all levels of experience.

Looking at the median salaries of the categories with the highest number of respondents at each experience level (city, county, and private consultant), we see that increases since 1985 have varied widely by employer and experience. For instance, entry-level city planners earned increases of only 3.8 percent since 1985, and their counterparts with five to 10 years experience received only a 2.6 percent increase. City planners with more than 10 years experience, however, reported a median salary that was 7.4 percent higher than the 1985 median salary. County planners at all experience levels fared well—an 8.4 percent increase for entry-level planners; 8.1 percent for those with five to 10 years experience; and six percent for those with more than 10 years experience. Consultants reported median salaries that

TABLE 6. PLANNERS' MEDIAN SALARIES: BY SEX, QUALIFICATIONS, EXPERIENCE, AND EMPLOYER

Experience and Employer	Total	Male (N = 5,413) B.A.	M.A.	Ph.D./Law	Total	Female (N = 1,601) B.A.	M.A.	Ph.D./Law	Total
Under 5 Years									
City/County/Joint/Metro/Regional	$24,400	$23,000	$25,000	$27,425*	$24,500	$23,000	$24,987	**	$24,159
State/Federal	26,936	25,500*	26,936	29,500*	27,000	**	27,800	**	25,000
Private Consultant/Business	27,000	25,000	28,500	**	28,000	26,250	29,000	**	26,500
University/Foundation	26,000	21,000*	25,600	36,000*	26,000	**	24,000	**	27,000
Other	27,080	26,500	27,250	**	27,500	31,000*	26,312	**	27,000
Between 5 and 10 Years									
City/County/Joint/Metro/Regional	31,000	29,930	32,000	37,500	31,000	29,000	31,000	**	30,000
State/Federal	35,742	34,528	35,800	43,875*	35,900	35,000	38,900	**	34,500
Private Consultant/Business	36,960	36,000	40,000	64,000*	38,600	33,250	34,600	**	34,000
University/Foundation	35,000	**	34,750	37,000	35,000	**	34,750	33,500*	34,750
Other	35,000	35,000	37,000	58,500*	37,500	29,849*	33,800	**	33,800
Over 10 Years									
City/County/Joint/Metro/Regional	41,000	39,000	42,850	57,152	41,000	35,900	40,584	37,000*	38,150
State/Federal	45,000	41,000	46,500	48,000	45,700	35,000*	43,000	**	41,300
Private Consultant/Business	50,000	50,000	53,500	55,000	52,000	48,000	42,550	**	45,000
University/Foundation	48,000	40,000	48,000	50,000	49,250	**	37,675	43,500	39,000
Other	44,650	39,150	48,500	52,550	45,500	34,750	43,750	**	40,650

TABLE 7. PLANNERS' MEDIAN SALARIES: BY SEX, QUALIFICATIONS, EXPERIENCE, AND EMPLOYER

Experience and Employer	Total	Male (N = 4,754) B.A.	M.A.	Ph.D./Law	Total	Female (N = 1,194) B.A.	M.A.	Ph.D./Law	Total
Under 5 Years									
City	$25,000	$24,262	$26,075	**	$25,000	$24,500	$25,150	**	$25,000
County	22,850	20,900	24,000	**	22,100	22,000	24,100	**	23,000
Joint City–County	23,500	**	23,500	**	23,500	20,078*	24,675	**	24,250
Metro/Regional	23,000	20,000	23,000	**	23,000	20,000*	23,562	**	23,381
State	26,300	**	26,700	**	28,550	**	22,000*	**	22,000*
Other Public	27,436	24,650	26,872	**	26,000	**	32,000*	**	30,000
Federal	32,000	**	32,567*	**	32,567	**	**	**	**
Private Consultant	27,000	24,750	28,000	**	28,000	25,500	30,000	**	26,500
Business	28,500	25,000*	30,750*	**	28,000	32,500*	27,500*	**	29,000
College/University	30,249	**	26,000*	36,000*	36,498	**	**	**	28,500*
Foundation	24,000	20,000*	25,200	**	24,500	**	22,500	**	21,000
Other	27,080	26,500	27,250	**	27,500	31,000*	26,312	**	27,000

Continued

* Fewer than 10 responses: Sample size not statistically significant.
**Fewer than five responses: Not included in table, but included in totals.

TABLE 7. CONTINUED

Experience and Employer	Total	Male (N = 4,754)				Female (N = 1,194)			
		B.A.	M.A.	Ph.D./Law	Total	B.A.	M.A.	Ph.D./Law	Total
Between 5 and 10 Years									
City	32,000	31,000	33,500	39,750*	32,412	30,000	32,000	**	31,500
County	29,000	27,891	30,750	40,000*	30,000	26,637	28,600	**	28,000
Joint City-County	29,250	29,000	30,500	**	30,150	25,000*	26,750*	**	26,750
Metro/Regional	29,000	25,750	29,350	**	28,625	27,395*	31,000	**	30,000
State	35,000	**	35,250	**	35,742	35,000*	35,400	**	34,650
Other Public	35,000	29,910	35,000	43,875*	34,528	39,200*	41,034	**	40,000
Federal	37,000	**	40,169	**	40,000	**	32,250	**	32,250
Private Consultant	35,000	36,000	38,300	45,000*	38,000	33,500	32,000	**	33,000
Business	42,000	37,500	45,000	**	45,000	**	38,000	**	38,000
College/University	35,500	**	35,000*	36,500	36,000	**	43,000*	33,500*	35,000
Foundation	34,125	**	34,500	**	34,750	**	31,000	**	31,000
Other	35,000	35,000	37,000	58,500*	37,500	29,849*	33,800	**	33,800
Over 10 Years									
City	43,000	41,500	45,000	52,100	43,000	37,000	41,250	**	40,000
County	37,700	34,112	40,000	**	38,000	30,000	40,000	**	36,250
Joint City-County	37,600	37,000	38,000	**	38,000	**	33,500*	**	32,600
Metro/Regional	40,100	38,370	41,000	**	40,177	36,625*	42,500	**	40,000
State	44,100	44,800	45,000	**	44,373	**	**	**	40,000*
Other Public	42,500	35,000	47,000	*	43,000	**	37,832	**	35,000
Federal	46,500	45,000	47,900	58,000*	47,950	**	43,000	**	43,000
Private Consultant	50,000	50,000	52,000	54,500	50,600	48,000	42,080	**	45,000
Business	55,000	61,000	58,000	95,000	58,000	45,000*	44,792	**	45,000*
College/University	48,314	48,500*	46,000	50,000	49,528	**	39,000	43,500	41,065
Foundation	44,050	38,500	49,300	50,000*	48,000	**	35,000	**	35,000
Other	44,650	39,150	48,500	52,550	45,500	34,750	43,750	**	40,650

* Fewer than 10 responses: Sample size not statistically significant.
**Fewer than five responses: Not included in table, but included in totals.

showed a 7.6 percent increase at the lowest level of experience and a 6.3 percent increase at the highest level of experience. Consultants in the middle experience category showed no change in median salary.

Over the last two years, there have also been discrepancies in the percentage of salary increase given to men and women working at these agencies. Respondents in city agency entry-level positions were the only ones who reported an increase in salary that did not differ by sex. The increase there was 3.8 percent. Female county planners in entry level positions reported a 9.1 percent increase while their male counterparts reported only a 4.8 percent increase. Among entry-level consultants, however, the increase for men was 8.4 percent and only 5.7 percent for women.

In the middle experience category, women in city agencies received a 4.7 percent increase; men got 2.7 percent. Among county planners, women in this experience category reported a 7.4 percent increase, and men reported an 8.8 percent increase. The median salary reported by female consultants in this category ($33,000) was 2.1 percent higher than in 1985, but was still below the total for all consultants with similar experience by $2,000. Male consultants, on the other hand, saw their median salary increase by 6.9 percent since 1985.

Finally, among planners with more than 10 years experience, women working in city agencies and those working as consultants reported large increases (11.3 percent and 28.3 percent, respectively). Female county planners earned only a 3.8 percent increase since 1985. For men, city and county planners reported better than average increases (7.4

TABLE 8. PLANNERS' MEDIAN SALARIES: BY SEX AND EMPLOYER

Employer	1985 Total (N = 6,094)	1985 Male (N = 4,872)	1985 Female (N = 1,222)	1987 Total (N = 7,192	1987 Male (N = 5,525	1987 Female (N = 1,667
City	$32,070	$33,816	$28,077	$34,716	$36,000	$30,000
County	29,324	30,572	24,084	31,000	32,600	26,462
Joint City/County	29,449	30,822	23,460	31,500	33,000	26,500
Metro/Regional	30,822	32,070	23,834	32,051	34,000	30,500
State Planning Agencies	33,317	35,064	30,073	38,000	40,000	34,000
Other Public Agencies	34,066	35,064	31,071	36,000	36,500	35,000
Federal	40,055	41,054	34,066	43,900	45,000	38,000
Private Consultants	40,055	42,052	30,073	42,000	45,000	32,000
Business	40,055	45,047	32,070	47,000	50,000	39,000
College/University	39,806	40,055	31,570	45,000	45,500	38,000
Nonprofit Foundations	34,066	35,688	29,823	35,000	38,750	30,000
Other	—	—	—	38,000	40,000	33,200

percent and 6.9 percent, respectively), while consultants reported only a 3.2 percent increase.

The largest increase in median salary (where there are a significant number of responses) was reported by the 252 respondents who work for a university or college and who have more than 10 years experience. That increase was 14.9 percent—slightly more than 2.5 times the average increase for all planners.

Table 8 makes it clear that, among public agency planners, only the median salary of planners working for the federal government comes close to that of planners in the private sector. Planners working for state agencies reported the next highest median salary among public agency planners, followed by planners working for other types of public agencies and city planners. At the low end of the scale are the salaries of planners working for county, joint city/county, and metropolitan/regional agencies. In the private sector, planners working for business continue to post the highest median salary, followed by academics and consultants. Planners working for nonprofit organizations had a median salary of $35,000—just slightly more than that of planners working in city agencies.

YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

Median salary increases in two experience categories were less than the overall median salary increase of 5.7 percent. (See Table 9.) Since 1985, the median salary of entry-level planners has risen only 3.8 percent, and, in the middle experience category, the median salary rose 4.6 percent. The salary increase reported by planners with more than 10 years of experience, on the other hand, was 9.1 percent. The fact that salary increases grew progressively with years of experience marks a reversal of a trend that we saw in 1985. The 1987 findings more closely reflect the trends we recognized in salary surveys before 1985.

Women fared better than men in two of the three experience categories. The salary increase reported by women planners in entry-level positions in 1987 was 8.3 percent compared to an increase of 3.8 percent for male planners with fewer than five years experience. Women now seem to have reached parity with men in entry-level planning positions. Both reported a median salary of $25,000. And among planners with more than 10 years experience, women reported a 10.9 percent increase since 1985, with men not far behind (a 9.1 percent increase). Despite the increase, the me-

TABLE 9. PLANNERS' MEDIAN SALARIES: BY SEX AND YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

Years of Experience	Median Salaries 1985 Total (N = 6,130)	1985 Male (N = 4,891)	1985 Female (N = 1,239)	1987 Total (N = 7,221)	1987 Male (N = 5,557)	1987 Female (N = 1,664)
Under 5 Years	$24,084	$24,333	$23,085	$25,000	$25,000	$25,000
5 to 10 Years	31,071	30,070	30,073	32,500	33,000	31,450
Over 10 Years	40,804	41,553	36,063	44,500	45,000	40,000

TABLE 10. PLANNERS' MEDIAN SALARIES: BY YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

	1987				
Years of Experience	Total (N = 7,193)	Male	N	Female	N
1	$21,460	$22,000	95	$20,900	56
2	23,772	24,000	177	23,000	136
3	25,400	25,309	240	25,500	160
4	27,000	27,000	222	26,515	153
5	29,000	29,250	212	28,573	137
6	30,000	30,000	174	28,700	97
7	31,250	32,000	220	30,000	126
8	33,853	34,000	236	33,000	114
9	34,470	35,000	227	33,000	82
10	36,000	36,000	451	35,750	152
11	38,000	38,050	191	37,750	66
12	38,064	38,500	281	38,000	71
13	40,200	40,000	241	40,319	67
14	41,110	41,500	267	40,000	41
15	43,600	43,900	381	42,000	51
16+	48,325	49,000	1,926	44,100	143

dian salary of men in the experience category was still $5,000 higher than that of women.

It was in the middle experience category that men clearly outgained women in median salary—9.7 percent to 4.6 percent. Where the median salaries for male and female planners were nearly identical in 1985, they are now separated by $1,550.

In response to many requests over the past two years from callers who wished to have an even finer breakdown of salaries by years of experience, we have produced a new table. (See Table 10.) While we do not have baseline data with which we can compare the 1987 median salaries at each year of experience, this table does provide some interesting insights. For instance, the median salary for all planners corresponds with the median salary reported by planners with 10 years of experience. Planners will be able to compare their salary with the median salary reported by other planners with the same amount of experience. Please remember, however, that there are some other clear distinctions to be made when comparing salaries—most notably type of employer (especially public agency as compared to private sector), qualifications, and region or state of employment (these figures will be given below).

COMPARISONS BY SIZE AND TYPE OF JURISDICTION

As might be expected, planners who work in large jurisdictions (greater than 250,000 population) earn higher salaries than their counterparts in smaller jurisdictions. (See Table 11.) But the differences between the median salaries of planners in large jurisdictions with those of planners in less populous jurisdictions is shrinking. At the entry-level, the difference between the median salary of a planner working

TABLE 11. PLANNERS' MEDIAN SALARIES: BY SEX, QUALIFICATIONS, EXPERIENCE, AND JURISDICTION SIZE

		Male (N = 3,813)				Female (N = 1,190)			
Experience and Employer	Total	B.A.	M.A.	Ph.D./Law	Total	B.A.	M.A.	Ph.D./Law	Total
Under 5 Years									
250,000 and over	$25,500	$23,500	$25,400	**	$25,000	$25,550	$25,550	**	$25,600
50,000 to 249,999	24,064	23,000	25,000	**	24,500	22,750	24,500	**	23,656
Under 50,000	24,159	22,500	25,600	**	24,654	22,000	24,450	**	23,800
Between 5 and 10 Years									
250,000 and over	32,000	32,976	32,850	41,000	33,000	30,000	32,000	**	31,419
50,000 to 249,999	31,000	30,000	31,500	37,000	31,000	29,312	31,400	**	30,600
Under 50,000	30,600	29,200	33,000	34,754*	31,000	28,550	30,425	**	29,500
Over 10 Years									
250,000 and over	45,000	43,000	46,350	51,000	45,500	38,000	42,224	43,000*	41,000
50,000 to 249,999	41,000	40,000	43,250	52,000	42,000	37,250	38,000	**	37,250
Under 50,000	38,000	36,031	39,972	52,100*	38,057	28,650	40,080	**	35,000

* Fewer than 10 responses: Sample size not statistically significant.
**Fewer than five responses.

TABLE 12. PUBLIC AGENCY PLANNERS' MEDIAN SALARIES: BY JURISDICTION TYPE

Jurisdiction		1985 (N = 3,757)		1987 (N = 4,363)	
Type	Size	Number	Median Salary	Number	Median Salary
Urban	250,000 or more	855	$35,064	637	$38,022
	50,000 to 249,999	692	32,569	656	36,000
	Under 50,000	456	29,574	491	31,538
Suburban	250,000 or more	193	32,070	133	35,464
	50,000 to 249,999	387	33,816	360	40,000
	Under 50,000	489	31,570	556	34,000
Rural	250,000 or more	38	30,447	15	30,000
	50,000 to 249,999	226	26,954	154	28,900
	Under 50,000	345	25,082	338	27,825
Mixed	250,000 or more	51	35,064	529	35,880
	50,000 to 249,999	23	31,071	380	30,665
	Under 50,000	2	29,324	114	29,478

in a large jurisdiction with that of a planner working in a small jurisdiction has been cut from 10.2 percent in 1985 to 5.3 percent in 1987. In the middle experience category, this difference is now only 4.4 percent as opposed to a difference of 10.3 percent in 1985 and a whopping 27.2 percent in 1983. Only in the highest experience category does the difference remain great—15.6 percent. But even that difference is less than the 17.4 percent reported in 1985.

The median salaries reported by planners working in mid-size jurisdictions (50,000 to 249,000 in population) and small jurisdictions (fewer than 50,000 population) differ very little in the first two experience categories. The difference in the over 10 years experience category is 7.3 percent in favor of the mid-size jurisdictions.

Differences in men's and women's median salaries are slight in all categories except the highest experience level. For entry-level planners, women working in large jurisdictions reported a higher median salary than that of their male counterparts. In all other categories, the median salary reported by women planners was lower than that of their male counterparts. In the first two experience categories, these differences ranged from 1.3 percent (for planners with five to 10 years experience working in mid-size jurisdictions) to 5.1 percent (for planners with five to 10 years experience working in small jurisdictions). In the highest experience category, women reported median salaries anywhere from eight percent (in small jusridictions) to 11.3 percent (in mid-size jurisdictions) lower.

A look at median salaries crosstabulated by type of jurisdiction reveals that, even with an incredible increase in the number of planners who said that they worked in "mixed" jurisdictions, the median salaries for those planners remained nearly the same as in 1985, with even a decrease reported by planners in mid-size, mixed jurisdictions. (See Table 12.) Increases were only 2.3 percent for planners working in large, mixed jurisdictions and .5 percent for planners working in small, mixed jurisdictions. If we go back to look at the figures for 1983, however, we see that increases over the past four years have been significant for this group (17 percent, 17.5 percent, and 11.6 percent, respectively, going from largest to smallest jurisdiction). The huge increase in the number of planners who said they work in mixed jurisdictions when compared with the 1983 and 1985 surveys (the first two surveys that included this type of jurisdiction as a choice for respondents) makes it difficult to draw any conclusions from the drastic change in salary between 1983 and 1985 and the slight change in the most current two-year period. It will remain to the 1989 survey to make clear just what the "typical" salary is for a planner in such a jurisdiction.

Planners working in suburban jurisdictions seemed to make out best in terms of salary increase. Two of the three largest increases in the table were reported by suburban planners in large and mid-size jurisdictions (9.6 percent and 15.5 percent, respectively). For small suburban jurisdictions, the reported increase was 7.7 percent, which is still higher than the average increase of 5.7 percent reported by all planners. Other "winners" included urban planners in mid-size jurisdictions (increase of 9.5 percent) and rural planners in small jurisdictions (increase of 9.9 percent). It should be noted, however, that all planners—except those who work in large, rural jurisdictions and, as noted above, those who work in mixed jurisdictions—posted salary increases greater than 5.7 percent. The planners working in large, rural jurisdictions posted a loss of 1.5 percent, and their representation in the survey dropped from 38 to 15. It might be that some of these planners are now included in the "mixed" category.

DIRECTORS AND STAFF

The questionnaire defined director as agency director, chief executive officer of a firm, or head of an academic department. All other respondents to the survey were considered staff. Tables 13 and 14 list the median salaries of directors and staff, respectively.

The percentage of planners who are directors and who responded to the survey is nearly the same as it was in 1985 (35 percent as compared to 36.5 percent in 1985). In fact, the percentage of respondents who are directors has remained relatively constant throughout the 1980s.

The greatest differences in median salary between directors and staff were reported by directors working for a state or federal agency with more than 10 years experience ($10,600 more than the staff median salary in that category); directors working in a university or foundation with more than 10 years experience ($7,000 more than their staff); and by planners who are directors of a consulting agency or in business in both the middle and greatest experience categories ($5,000 greater than the reported staff median salary).

The differences between director and staff salaries were less for those planners working in public agencies than they were for those working in the private sector at each experience level (if we throw out the "other" category and note the exception of planners with more than 10 years experience and working at state or federal agencies). These differences are greater with the increase in level of experience, growing from a $650 difference for entry-level planners, to $2,500 for planners with five to 10 years experience, to $4,500 for planners with more than 10 years experience.

The most significant difference in salaries of directors and staff members of the same sex occurs among male planners with 10 or more years of experience working in business or as private consultants, for whom the difference is $8,000 or 16 percent. Men in the middle experience category who worked as directors of consulting agencies or in business reported the next greatest difference in dollars ($7,250), which is a difference of 16 percent. For women with more than 10 years experience and working as consultants or in business, the difference between director and staff salaries was $3,780 or 8.2 percent; this was nearly the same difference (in dollars) between women planners with more than 10 years experience working for local public agencies. The percentage difference in that category, however, was 9.5 percent.

Despite an increase of 72 more women directors in 1987 than in 1985 (an increase of nearly 29 percent), there are so few women directors that it is difficult to get statistically significant median salary figures that can be compared with women staff members. In general, it is true that where such

TABLE 13. NONDIRECTORS' MEDIAN SALARIES: BY SEX, QUALIFICATIONS, EXPERIENCE, AND EMPLOYER

		Male (N = 3,234)				Female (N = 1,329)			
Experience and Employer	**Total**	B.A.	M.A.	Ph.D./Law	Total	B.A.	M.A.	Ph.D./Law	Total
Under 5 Years									
City/County/Joint/Metro/Regional	$24,150	$23,000	$25,000	$27,963*	$24,100	$23,000	$25,000	**	$24,400
State/Federal	26,636	25,500*	26,872	**	26,872	**	27,800	**	25,000
Private Consultant/Business	27,000	25,750	28,000	**	28,000	25,650	29,000	**	26,250
University/Foundation	26,000	22,000*	25,200	36,000*	26,000	**	22,500	**	27,000
Other	27,000	24,500	25,500	**	25,500	31,000*	26,312	**	27,160
Between 5 and 10 Years									
City/County/Joint/Metro/Regional	30,000	29,500	31,000	28,000*	30,300	29,156	30,830	**	30,000
State/Federal	35,621	34,528	35,800	44,500*	35,800	35,000	33,000	**	34,500
Private Consultant/Business	35,000	34,500	38,000	45,000*	37,750	32,000	33,900	**	33,250
University/Foundation	35,000	**	35,000	37,000	36,000	**	31,840	**	32,000
Other	35,000	35,000	37,750	**	39,000	29,425*	34,000	**	33,800
Over 10 Years									
City/County/Joint/Metro/Regional	38,473	36,712	40,000	47,000*	39,000	36,000	39,500	**	38,000
State/Federal	44,000	38,000	45,700	48,000	44,646	35,000*	43,000	**	40,000
Private Consultant/Business	50,000	45,000	51,000	51,000	50,000	44,000	42,050	**	42,100
University/Foundation	45,000	36,500	45,000	46,670	45,750	**	37,675	42,000	39,000
*Other	43,000	38,450	46,000	52,000*	44,275	35,000*	44,000	**	40,650

* Fewer than 10 responses: Sample size not statistically significant.
**Fewer than five responses.

TABLE 14. DIRECTORS' MEDIAN SALARIES: BY SEX, QUALIFICATIONS, EXPERIENCE, AND EMPLOYER

Experience and Employer	Total	Male (N = 2,268)				Female (N = 322)			
		B.A.	M.A.	Ph.D./Law	Total	B.A.	M.A.	Ph.D./Law	Total
Under 5 Years									
City/County/Joint/Metro/Regional	$24,800	$24,000	$25,850	**	$25,000	$25,000	$24,159	**	$24,118
State/Federal	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Private Consultant/Business	30,000*	**	**	**	25,000*	**	**	**	**
University/Foundation	30,000	**	26,000*	**	29,000*	**	**	**	**
Other	27,500	**	27,750	**	28,000	**	**	**	**
Between 5 and 10 Years									
City/County/Joint/Metro/Regional	32,500	30,000	34,000	42,000*	32,700	29,000	34,000	**	31,500
State/Federal	40,000*	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Private Consultant/Business	40,000	40,000	45,000	**	45,000	38,000	35,000	**	35,000
University/Foundation	37,800	**	34,125	**	34,125	**	41,250*	**	40,000*
Other	35,000	33,250*	34,000	**	35,000	**	33,200*	**	34,100*
Over 10 Years									
City/County/Joint/Metro/Regional	43,000	40,000	45,500	57,304	43,311	34,750	46,000	**	42,000
State/Federal	54,600	51,500	62,000	**	54,800	**	**	**	**
Private Consultant/Business	55,000	55,000	59,000	67,500	58,000	50,000*	45,000	**	45,880
University/Foundation	52,000	48,500*	52,000	59,000	52,050	**	37,000*	**	39,500*
Other	47,400	40,700	51,000	**	48,000	**	43,000*	**	35,250*

* Fewer than 10 responses: Sample size not statistically significant.
**Fewer than five responses.

comparisons can be made, the difference between the median salary of women planners who are directors and those who are not is not as great (in dollars or percentage) as the differences between the median salary of male directors and their staff.

A STATE-BY-STATE BREAKDOWN OF SALARIES

Because we received many requests over the past two years for more information on median salaries by state rather than by region, we have supplied a listing of salaries by state and have abandoned our table for regions. (See Table 15.) Planners in six states (Alaska, California, Hawaii, Nevada, New Jersey, and New York) and the District of Columbia reported a median salary greater than $40,000. And planners in only seven other states (Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Maryland, Michigan, Rhode Island, and Texas) reported a median salary equal to or above the median salary for all planners in 1987 ($36,000).

In 22 states and the District of Columbia, men reported a median salary equal to or greater than that for all planners in 1987; in only three states and the District of Columbia did women report a median salary equal to or greater than the median salary for all planners. Experience level plays a greater role here than any other factor, perhaps, but it is still interesting to see such great differences on a state-by-state basis between the salaries of men and those of women. Without going into an exhaustive list, some of the greatest differences between the salaries of men and women were reported by planners working in Arizona ($10,000), California ($7,500), Connecticut ($8,750), D.C. ($7,727), Florida ($7,500), Georgia ($8,250), Hawaii ($15,250), Maryland ($9,000), Massachusetts ($8,000), Minnesota ($7,800), Nevada ($13,000), New Hampshire ($11,000), New Jersey ($11,750), and Texas ($10,500).

This table will serve as baseline data for future reports. Future reports will be able to track increases and decreases in median salary levels for each state as well as representation in the survey. What is not clear from this table is the degree to which salaries of planners are affected by the state in which they work. In past reports, we suggested that years of experience is, perhaps, the dominant factor in assessing how much a planner should earn. But, consider this. Nearly 29 percent of all respondents in the U.S. work in California, the District of Columbia, New Jersey, New York, or Texas. The fact that planners in these states (and the District of Columbia) report a median salary equal to or greater than that for all planners indicates that where you work may be as important to some degree as how much experience you have. Unless, of course, the experience level in these states is also high, which is the chief factor pushing up the median salary. In any case, the graying of the profession noted in Part 1 of the report and this new data that shows the high

TABLE 15: PLANNERS' MEDIAN SALARIES: BY SEX AND STATE

State	Total	Male	N	Female	N	State	Total	Male	N	Female	N
Alabama	$34,500	$35,350	38	$31,850	12	Nebraska	35,000	37,750	30	30,625	10
Alaska	45,000	46,000	31	38,480	14	Nevada	42,000	43,000	38	30,000	14
Arizona	34,700	40,000	122	30,000	46	New Mexico	30,000	35,000	28	28,000	17
Arkansas	28,938	30,000	21	26,000	6	New Hampshire	31,000	36,000	37	25,000	11
California	43,000	45,000	824	37,500	311	New Jersey	42,713	45,750	148	34,000	46
Colorado	34,716	35,592	169	30,450	48	New York	40,000	40,008	256	36,800	66
Connecticut	36,000	39,000	98	30,250	36	North Carolina	30,000	32,000	200	25,650	55
Delaware	36,700	44,414	16	28,800	4	North Dakota	32,000	32,000	9	—	—
District of Columbia	50,450	54,200	75	46,473	23	Ohio	31,800	32,570	158	25,600	33
Florida	35,000	37,000	433	29,500	114	Oklahoma	34,500	34,500	36	30,750	6
Georgia	35,389	37,250	100	29,000	28	Oregon	34,000	34,632	127	32,388	39
Hawaii	45,000	45,000	33	29,750	4	Pennsylvania	31,500	32,000	193	30,000	46
Idaho	27,750	31,314	18	24,800	6	Rhode Island	37,000	38,357	24	30,000	9
Illinois	36,000	37,500	191	32,000	57	South Carolina	32,000	35,850	62	24,198	20
Indiana	29,500	32,000	57	26,800	20	South Dakota	33,000	33,500	5	24,500	2
Iowa	35,000	36,500	63	28,500	16	Tennessee	31,538	34,410	92	24,500	29
Kansas	31,000	32,000	52	26,000	9	Texas	36,000	39,000	265	28,500	85
Kentucky	30,000	31,500	56	26,165	11	Utah	34,000	35,244	63	24,750	8
Louisiana	35,500	40,000	52	30,500	16	Vermont	26,000	28,850	20	25,415	11
Maine	27,750	27,750	20	27,578	8	Virginia	34,535	35,871	240	28,500	87
Maryland	36,890	39,000	142	30,000	41	Washington	34,000	35,000	145	30,000	48
Massachusetts	35,000	38,000	158	30,000	66	West Virginia	26,000	26,160	13	23,350	4
Michigan	37,950	39,000	155	33,705	27	Wisconsin	33,372	34,000	123	29,200	12
Minnesota	34,000	36,000	115	28,200	38	Wyoming	30,250	30,000	19	31,000	5
Mississippi	26,500	27,500	15	19,067	2						
Missouri	34,000	35,000	75	28,100	30	Canada	55,000	55,000	77	46,000	6
Montana	24,700	25,500	16	24,000	9	Other	39,000	42,000	28	18,000	9

level of representation from states with high median salaries puts the median salary for all planners in a new light.

MINORITY REPRESENTATION AND SALARIES

Table 16 indicates that 5.5 percent of the respondents to the 1987 survey were minority group members. This is a slight (.6 percent) increase over the figures reported in 1985. Minority representation among male respondents was up to 5.3 percent from 4.8 percent in 1985. And 6.5 percent of the women respondents to the 1987 survey are minority group members, as opposed to only five percent in 1985.

Among minority respondents, Blacks and Asians are best

TABLE 16. DISTRIBUTION OF PLANNERS: BY RACE/ETHNICITY

	Number of Respondents (Percent of Total Respondents)					
	1983		1985		1987	
Race/Ethnicity	Male (N = 5,998)	Female (N = 1,440)	Male (N = 5,166)	Female (N = 1,315)	Male (N = 5,618)	Female (N = 1,702)
White	5,660 (76.1%)	1,347 (18.1%)	4,917 (75.8%)	1,249 (19.3%)	5,321 (72.7)%	1,591 (21.7%)
Black	93 (1.3)	44 (0.6)	83 (1.3)	39 (0.6)	90 (1.2)	50 (0.7)
Hispanic	84 (1.1)	16 (0.2)	41 (0.6)	4 (0.1)	85 (1.2)	30 (0.4)
American Indian	15 (0.2)	2 (0.0)	5 (0.1)	1 (0.0)	7 (0.1)	6 (0.1)
Asian	126 (1.7)	29 (0.4)	102 (1.6)	20 (0.3)	115 (1.6)	25 (0.3)
Other	20 (0.3)	2 (0.0)	18 (0.3)	2 (0.0)	—	—

TABLE 17. PLANNERS' MEDIAN SALARIES: BY RACE/ETHNICITY, QUALIFICATIONS, EXPERIENCE, AND EMPLOYER

Experience and Employer	Total	Nonminority (N = 6,726)				Minority (N = 392)			
		B.A.	M.A.	Ph.D./Law	Total	B.A.	M.A.	Ph.D./Law	Total
Under 5 Years									
City/County/Joint/Metro/Regional	$24,400	$23,000	$25,000	$26,543*	$24,400	$23,548	$25,000	**	$25,000
State/Federal	26,936	23,800	27,800	29,500*	27,800	**	**	**	**
Private Consultant/Business	27,000	25,750	28,500	**	27,000	**	28,000*	**	27,000*
University/Foundation	26,000	20,100	26,000	36,000	27,000	**	**	**	**
Between 5 and 10 Years									
City/County/Joint/Metro/Regional	31,000	29,930	31,600	40,000	31,000	27,000	32,000	**	30,000
State/Federal	35,742	34,528	35,621	42,938	35,250	**	**	**	39,000*
Private Consultant/Business	36,960	34,000	37,000	56,000*	36,000	**	41,750*	**	40,750
University/Foundation	35,000	35,000*	34,500	36,000	35,000	**	35,750	**	34,500*
Over 10 Years									
City/County/Joint/Metro/Regional	41,000	38,448	42,165	55,000	41,000	40,000	42,500	**	41,644
State/Federal	45,000	38,250	46,000	48,000	45,000	**	50,800	**	49,500
Private Consultant/Business	50,000	50,000	51,000	61,000	50,000	36,000*	50,000	**	50,000
University/Foundation	48,000	40,000	45,500	50,000	48,000	**	40,000	48,000	45,000

* Fewer than 10 responses: Sample size not statistically significant.
**Fewer than five responses.

represented (34.4 percent and 34.2 percent of minority respondents, respectively). Hispanics now make up 28.1 percent of the minority respondents. Considering group representation by sex, Asian men are best represented (28.1 percent of all minority respondents), followed by Black men (22.1 percent), Hispanic men (20.8 percent), and Black women (12.3 percent).

While there were actual increases in every category of minority representation, most categories changed very little in terms of percentage of minority representation among all respondents. The exception to this statement was representation among Hispanics. The largest increase in minority group representation was among Hispanic women, who had only four respondents in 1985. (.1 percent of all respondents in 1985) and have 30 in 1987 (.4 percent of all respondents). Hispanic men also increased in representation significantly, more than doubling both the number and percentage of respondents since 1985. For Hispanic men, the 85 responses in 1987 regains all of the loss in representation between 1983 and 1985. American Indian women and Black women also saw an increase in the past two years, but each picked up only an additional .1 percent in representation in the total survey.

As has been true in past surveys, there is little difference in salaries reported by minority members and those reported by nonminority members. (See Table 17.) In most cases, the median salaries reported by planners who are minority group members are higher than those reported by their nonminority group counterparts. The only category with a notable difference is that for planners working in a university or foundation with more than 10 years experience. There, minority planners reported a median salary that is 6.7 percent less than their nonminority counterparts.

Where the figures are statistically significant, minority planners posted better than average salary gains over the past two years with the notable exception of an actual salary decrease in one category. Entry-level minority group planners in local public agencies reported a median salary that was 8.7 percent higher than the one they reported in 1985. Other gains were 14 percent for minority planners with five to 10 years experience working as consultants or in business; eight percent for local public agency planners in the highest experience group; 11.3 percent for minority planners with more than 10 years experience working for a federal or state agency; and 11 percent for minority planners in the highest experience group working in a university or foundation. Minority planners working in local public agencies in the middle experience group reported a median salary that was relatively unchanged since 1985. The notable exception mentioned above was for minority planners with 10 or more years of experience working as consultants or in business. They posted a median salary that was 4.1 percent lower than the one they reported in 1985.

WOMEN MAKE GAINS IN REPRESENTATION AND SALARY

The proportion of women planners in APA has grown steadily throughout the 1980s. In 1981, according to our survey for that year, women made up 18.1 percent of APA membership. According to our results for 1987, women now make up 23.1 percent of APA membership—an absolute gain of 2.8 percent since 1985. (See Table 18.) There has been

TABLE 18. YEARS OF PLANNERS' EXPERIENCE: BY SEX

Years Worked	Number and Percent of All Male Respondents		Number and Percent of All Female Respondents	
	Male (N = 5,641)		Female (N = 1,690)	
1	115	(2.0%)	71	(4.2%)
2	180	(3.2)	138	(8.2)
3	243	(4.3)	161	(9.5)
4	223	(3.6)	157	(9.3)
5	215	(3.8)	140	(8.3)
6	176	(3.1)	100	(5.9)
7	222	(3.9)	126	(7.5)
8	238	(4.2)	115	(6.8)
9	229	(4.0)	84	(5.0)
10-14	1,447	(25.7)	400	(23.7)
15-19	1,025	(18.2)	131	(7.8)
20 plus	1,328	(23.5)	67	(4.0)

TABLE 19. WHERE PLANNERS WORK: BY EMPLOYER AND SEX

Type of Employer	Number and Percent of All Male Respondents		Number and Percent of All Female Respondents	
	Male (N = 5,608)		Female (N = 1,694)	
City Planning	1,911	(34.1%)	650	(38.4%)
County Planning	744	(13.3)	232	(13.7)
Joint City/County	160	(2.9)	49	(2.9)
Metro or Regional	354	(6.3)	93	(5.5)
State Planning	120	(2.1)	33	(2.0)
Other Public Agencies	148	(2.6)	53	(3.1)
Federal	132	(2.4)	29	(1.7)
Consultants	1,084	(19.3)	263	(15.5)
Business	197	(3.5)	59	(3.5)
University or College	295	(5.3)	53	(3.1)
Nonprofit	123	(2.2)	58	(3.4)
Other	340	(6.1)	122	(7.2)

a 21.7 percent rate of increase in the representation of women in APA over the last six years.

And the biggest gains in the representation of women planners in APA continue to be made in the fewer than five years of experience category. Women now make up 44 percent of that group, an actual increase of 5.3 percent since 1985. For that group, since 1981, there has been an actual increase of nearly 10 percent, a rate of increase of 23 percent. If entry-level women planners do not leave the profession to pursue other careers, the chances are that they will achieve equal representation in APA membership sometime in the not-too-distant future. This is made even clearer by our projections about the median number of years in the profession for each sex. The median experience level for men is around 12.5 years; the median for women is somewhere between six and seven years.

Among public agency planners, the number of women working in city planning agencies jumped by over 50 percent since 1985, increasing from 419 to 650 respondents and from 33.5 percent of all women respondents to 38.4 percent. (See Table 19.) All other public agency categories showed a loss of women respondents in terms of percentage. And all private-sector categories also showed losses in terms of percentage. It should be noted, however, that the inclusion of the "other" category may account for some of these losses. As discussed in Part 1, this category covers a myriad of both public and private employers.

There were more women planning directors among respondents than in any previous survey. In 1985, 250 women said they were directors; in 1987, that number has jumped to 322. Despite that increase in number, the percentage of women who are directors is down one percent since 1985—from 20 percent to 19 percent. Compare this figure with the one for men. Just slightly more than 40 percent of the male respondents are also directors. The increase in the number of directors who are women, however, means that now nearly one out of every eight directors is a women. In 1985, that ratio was one out of every nine.

The percent of increase in median salary for women over the past two years (6.9 percent) was less than the increase for men during that period (8.4 percent). (See Table 20.) Both percentages of increase were higher, however, than that for all planners (5.7 percent). And, of course, the greater percentage increase for men, because they started with a higher median, meant that the dollar increase in their median salary ($2,936) was substantially higher than that for women ($1,948). This discrepancy in increase also meant that the median salary of women slipped one percent in relation to the median salary of men. In 1985, the median salary of women planners was 80.1 percent of that of men; it is now 79 percent of that of men. It is important to point out once again, however, that these figures are not surprising given that the median level of experience for women is 6.5 years, whereas the median level of experience for men is 12.5 years.

TABLE 20. PLANNERS' MEDIAN SALARIES: BY SEX

Year	Median Salaries		
	Total	Male	Female
1977	$19,500	$20,000	$16,000
1980	24,000	24,800	19,300
1981	25,990	27,630	21,050
1983	29,630	31,500	25,000
1985	34,066	35,064	28,077
1987	36,000	38,000	30,025

RECENT PLANNING ADVISORY SERVICE REPORTS

359 **Reducing Landslide Hazards: A Guide for Planners.** March 1981. 29 pp. $12; PAS subscribers $6.

360 **Regulating Mobile Homes.** April 1981. 28 pp. $12; PAS subscribers $6.

361 **Oblique Aerial Photography for Urban Planning.** May 1981. 26 pp. $12; PAS subscribers $6.

362 **Loft Conversions: Planning Issues, Problems, and Prospects.** August 1981. 38 pp. $12; PAS subscribers $6.

363 **Linking Plans and Regulations: Local Responses to Consistency Laws in California and Florida.** September 1981. 26 pp. $12; PAS subscribers $6.

364 **Reducing Earthquake Risks: A Planner's Guide.** October 1981. 82 pp. $18; PAS subscribers $9.

365 **Accessory Apartments: Using Surplus Space in Single-Family Houses.** December 1981. 24 pp. $12; PAS subscribers $6.

366 **Planners' Salaries and Employment Trends, 1981.** January 1982. 22 pp. $12 (xerox).

367 **Zero Lot Line Development.** March 1982. 22 pp. $12; PAS subscribers $6.

368 **Designing Effective Pedestrian Improvements in Business Districts.** May 1982. 60 pp. $16; PAS subscribers $8.

369 **A Planner's Guide to Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal.** August 1982. 53 pp. $12; PAS subscribers $6.

370 **Regulating Videogames.** September 1982. 30 pp. $12; PAS subscribers $6.

371 **Changing Development Standards for Affordable Housing.** October 1982. 30 pp. $12; PAS subscribers $6.

372 **Using Microcomputers in Urban Planning.** November 1982. 22 pp. $8.

373 **Water Conservation in Residential Development: Land-Use Techniques.** December 1982. 34 pp. $16; PAS subscribers $8.

374 **Preparing a Historic Preservation Ordinance.** February 1983. 46 pp. $16; PAS subscribers $8.

375 **Planning for Underground Space.** April 1983. 54 pp. $16; PAS subscribers $8.

376 **Improving Street Climate Through Urban Design.** June 1983. 34 pp. $16; PAS subscribers $8.

377 **Flexible Parking Requirements.** August 1983. 38 pp. $16; PAS subscribers $8.

378 **Working With Consultants.** October 1983. 33 pp. $16; PAS subscribers $8.

379 **Appearance Codes for Small Communities.** October 1983. 26 pp. $16; PAS subscribers $8.

380 **Analyzing the Economic Feasibility of a Development Project: A Guide for Planners.** November 1983. 38 pp. $16; PAS subscribers $8.

381 **Increasing Housing Opportunities for the Elderly.** December 1983. 16 pp. $16; PAS subscribers $8.

382 **Planners' Salaries and Employment Trends, 1983.** February 1984. 18 pp. $16; PAS subscribers $8.

*383 **How To Set Up a Planning Agency Library.** April 1984. 38 pp. PAS subscribers $8.

*384 **Regulating Radio and TV Towers.** June 1984. 38 pp. PAS subscribers $8.

385 **Affordable Single-Family Housing: A Review of Development Standards.** August 1984. 117 pp. $16; PAS subscribers $8.

386 **State and Local Regulations for Reducing Agricultural Erosion.** September 1984. 42 pp. $16; PAS subscribers $8.

387 **Traffic Impact Analysis.** October 1984. 34 pp. $16; PAS subscribers $8.

388 **Planning Software Survey.** November 1984. 32 pp. $16; PAS subscribers $8.

389 **Tax Increment Financing: Part 1. What Is TIF? Part 2. Determining Potential Gains and Losses of TIF.** December 1984. 19 pp. $16; PAS subscribers $8.

390 **Infrastructure Support for Economic Development.** September 1985. 38 pp. $16; PAS subscribers $8.

*391 **Home Occupation Ordinances.** October 1985. 38 pp. PAS subscribers $8.

392 **Innovative Capital Financing.** December 1985. 38 pp. $16; PAS subscribers $8.

*393 **Managing Municipal Information Needs Using Microcomputers.** April 1986. 22 pp. PAS subscribers $8.

394 **Regulating Satellite Dish Antennas.** May 1986. 30 pp. $16; PAS subscribers $8.

*395 **Planners' Salaries and Employment Trends, 1985.** June 1986. 18 pp. PAS subscribers $8.

*396 **Standards for Self-Service Storage Facilities.** September 1986. 22 pp. PAS subscribers $8.

397 **Siting Group Homes for Developmentally Disabled Persons.** October 1986. 46 pp. $16; PAS subscribers $8.

398 **Regulating Manufactured Housing.** December 1986. 38 pp. $16; PAS subscribers $8.

399 **Aesthetics and Land-Use Controls.** December 1986. 46 pp. $16; PAS subscribers $8.

*400 **The Planning Commission: Its Composition and Function, 1987.** May 1987. 11 pp. PAS subscribers $8.

*401 **Transferable Development Rights Programs: TDRs and the Real Estate Marketplace.** May 1987. 38 pp. $16; PAS subscribers $8.

*402 **Seven Methods for Calculating Land Capability Suitability.** July 1987. 22 pp. PAS subscribers $10.

403 **Computer Applications in Economic Development.** August 1987. 38 pp. $20; PAS subscribers $10.

*404 **How to Conduct a Citizen Survey.** November 1987. 24 pp. PAS subscribers $10.

405 **New Standards for Nonresidential Uses.** December 1987. 26 pp. $20; PAS subscribers $10.

406 **Housing Trust Funds.** December 1987. 25 pp. $20; PAS subscribers $10.

*407 **Planners' Salaries and Employment Trends, 1987.** December 1987. 15 pp. PAS subscribers $10.

*Available only to subscribers of Planning Advisory Service.